DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 364 CS 003 651

AUTHOR Shafer, Robert E.
TITLE A Comparative Study of Successful Practices and Materials for Teaching Reading in the Primary Schools as Viewed by Teachers in England and the United States.
PUB DATE Jul 76
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the United Kingdom Reading Association (13th, Durham, England, July 26-July 30, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; Comparative Education; Educational Accountability; Educational Research; Educational Trends; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Foreign Countries; Language Arts; *Open Education; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Materials; *Reading Research; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS California (Los Angeles); *England

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the growth of open education programs that were developed first in Britain and then in the United States, and it notes conflicts between the open education movement and demands for accountability that emerged in England and later in the United States. The paper then describes a study in which 23 teachers in England and 25 teachers in the greater Los Angeles area, all teachers of children aged five through eleven, were interviewed about their views concerning various language arts teaching methods and materials. Samples of comments made by six English teachers and six American teachers are presented. The paper notes major trends that emerged in the interviews, regarding reading series used and restrictions placed on teachers by head teachers and principals. In general, the English teachers tended to use the child's natural language in teaching beginning reading, and American teachers relied more on a reading series as the basic means of teaching reading. The final section of the paper again discusses the open-education/accountability conflict. In England, no significant proposal has been made for a major shift away from informal education, but, in the United States, there seems to be a significant trend away from open education. (GW)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145364

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"A Comparative Study of Successful Practices and Materials for Teaching Reading in the Primary Schools as Viewed by Teachers in England and the United States."

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert E. Shafer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

Robert E. Shafer
Department of English
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281
U.S.A.

United Kingdom Reading Association
Conference
University of Durham
Durham, England

July 26-30, 1976

With cooperation of the following:

Comparative Studies Section
Educational Studies Department
University of Oxford
Oxford, England

Department of English
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

School of Education
Pepperdine University
Los Angeles, California

And the cooperating schools, teachers, and consultants in England and the United States.*

CS 003 651

*See Appendices A and B for a complete list of cooperating schools and teachers.

Introduction

Most Americans probably heard first about British primary schools with their concepts of "open education," "informal education," and "collaborative learning," through Charles E. Silberman's book, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. Silberman's book was a widely read volume which influenced many American parents and educators. It was the result of a three-and-one-half year study of American schooling supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York. In general, Silberman condemned most American schools as "grim, repressive, joyless places," documenting his observations with many examples from American schools. Silberman blamed the problem not on evil intent or ignorance, but on a rather widely prevailing "mindlessness," a failure "to think seriously or deeply about the purposes or consequences of education." [1] Silberman went on to propose that the British primary schools he had visited during the course of the study were places which could be "humane and still educate well." He proposed that many of the British primary schools were simultaneously child-centered and subject- or knowledge-centered. He noted that they stressed aesthetic and moral education without weakening basic education. He proposed that the teachers who had changed to open education in both England and the United States found their major rewards in the quality of relationships with

their students and in their new roles as independently responsible professionals. Silberman's book stimulated great interest among the American public in British primary education, an interest which was already being developed within professional education by such educators as Vincent R. Rogers, one of the few American educators who had observed British informal schools at first hand before 1967 and who had returned to write on the subject. [2] In the late sixties and early seventies Americans were subjected to an avalanche of writings generally concerned with the development of open schools, open classrooms, reforms in American school architecture to accommodate "openness," and descriptions of methods and materials appropriate for open education. Books like Charles H. Rathbone's Open Education: the Informal Classroom [3], Joseph Featherstone's Schools Where Children Learn [4], E. Wallby Nyquist and Gene R. Hawes' Open Education: A Source Book for Parents and Teachers [5], and Alexander Frazier's Open Schools for Children [6], became influential in American education.

In England, growing from the influential Plowden Report [7], books like Leonard Marsh's Alongside the Child: Experiences in the English Primary School [8], and many others continuing through the nineteen seventies brought about a variety of developments in open and in formal education. Within the United States, specialists in open education were brought from England to give in-service training to teachers in states like North Dakota and

Maryland. Model open schools opened in a variety of school districts. In some ... es, new elementary schools were built on the open plan and teachers inserted in them whether they had specialized training or not. Hordes of visiting Americans descended on British primary schools. Indeed, "open education" and "informal education" caught on and became a virtual "bandwagon." In England, informal education continued as a viable educational philosophy but opposition was crystallizing. In a collection of papers known as the "Black Papers" a more conservative voice was heard [9].

Reaction

Although various moves toward "accountability" had been developing in the United States throughout the mid- and later nineteen sixties, the "accountability movement" had only begun to reach the majority of teachers in the United States in 1972. True, the National Assessment of Educational Progress had begun its work in the mid-sixties and more and more state legislatures were passing laws to develop statewide assessments of language and reading, and teachers were being asked to write behavioral objectives. But the conflicts between open education and accountability in the United States were yet to occur. When in 1972 the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales published, The Trend of Reading Standards [10], it established

that "there is a high probability that reading comprehension standards of juniors had declined somewhat since 1964, and on the combined bases of both WV and NS6 tests, the mean scores of juniors and seniors had undergone no significant rise or fall since 1960/61." [11] In speculating why these standards in junior schools had declined and the standards for secondary schools remained static, the authors of the report speculated as to whether the amount of curriculum time for reading had changed or whether the methods of instruction had changed. They speculated as to the preparation of infant and junior teachers, and they also speculated as to whether the "less formalized methods" that had been introduced into the schools in the last two decades would not necessarily mean that less time was devoted to reading. They quoted the then President of the UKRA, Mrs. Vera Southgate, that "there has been a declining interest in reading, especially in the 'infant classes,'" where she noted a decrease in the acceptance of the importance of learning to read. [12] The authors of The Trend of Reading Standards quoted further research by Keith Gardner indicating that "the attention to reading had changed between 1961 and 1967, as in the former years some twenty-five percent of the first year primary school pupils in his sample of two-thousand had not started to learn to read and this percentage increased annually until in 1967 it had reached forty percent."[13] Scott and Wells went on to cite other research indicating that there seemed to be less emphasis on the teaching of reading for

probationary primary teachers in various parts of England which led to an increased demand for in-service training at various active reading centers. It seemed to suggest that the "less formal methods" which had come into play in teaching reading in the fifties and sixties were ultimately resulting in a decline in the reading ability of children in primary schools in England. Although this was an educational research report it created headlines in the popular press. Sir Alan Bullock on a trip to Japan received a call from Margaret Thatcher, then Secretary of State, who upon seeing the headlines decided that a national committee of inquiry should be established to look into, "all aspects of teaching use of English, including reading, writing and speech," concerned with "how present practices might be improved and the role that initial and in-service training might play," and "to what extent arrangements for monitoring a general level of attainment in these skills could be introduced or improved; and to make recommendations." [14] Sir Alan Bullock accepted the offer to Chair the Committee of Inquiry and we have before us some four and one-half years later the now famous Bullock Report, A Language for Life. [15]

In the United States, drops in scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test have been offset by reports that show no decline, but instead tell of a slight rise in the performance of high school juniors and a similar rise for lower grade students on a

variety of standardized tests. The mixed results on tests of reading and language skills have lead to continuing controversy and some research into the implications of using criterion-referenced testing and other forms of evaluation and measurement, rather than commercially produced standardized tests. Few of the researchers in either country have gone directly to teachers to ask them their own views concerning the effects of various methods and materials on the "realities" of the child in the school, and in the particular society. In this study, the data was obtained directly from teachers in interviews usually conducted in their own schools.

The Schools, the Teachers, and the Setting

No statistically representative sample was formally developed for this study. Nevertheless, the data was collected in both countries representing a definite cross section of England and of a major metropolitan community in the United States -- Los Angeles, California. Twenty-three teachers were interviewed in twenty-one schools in England and twenty-five teachers were interviewed representing twenty-five schools in the greater Los Angeles area. In the case of England, the schools were chosen on the recommendation of specialists in language arts and reading, including advisers from local school authorities, H.M.I.s, and university personnel from teacher

education programs who were familiar with the schools. In the United States similarly, supervisors, reading specialists , and university personnel of teacher education programs were used to recommend schools and teachers. In England, recommended schools ranged throughout the greater London area, the Midlands, East Anglia, Devon, Buckinghamshire, Berkshire, Yorkshire, and Lancashire. In the case of Los Angeles, most of the schools were confined to the Los Angeles City Schools, ranging from the city center to Orange County on the south, and Culver City on the west. In both countries teachers represented a variety of ages, of geographical and social origins, and of length of service in the teaching profession. In England, headmasters and headmistresses, and deputy headmasters and headmistresses who taught children at least part of the time, were included in the sample; but in the United States, principals, since none were found who actually taught children, were excluded.[16]

Procedures

In each case, the school was visited for a period of at least one day by the researcher. In most cases, the teacher was interviewed either in his or her school or at a nearby university. (Appendices A and B contain the lists of teachers and schools used in both countries.) Teachers were asked whether or not they would object to having their classes observed, and in

most cases the classes of all teachers interviewed were observed. An interview schedule was developed, field tested, and eventually used in conducting the interviews. (Appendix C contains the interview schedule used in both countries.) The interviews were recorded and analyzed for significant trends.

Teachers' Comments: Methods and Materials

The data was coded with respect to comments made by teachers in both countries concerned with methods and materials. No statistical analysis of the data has been undertaken for this paper. Rather, teacher comments have been used to illustrate the views of teachers of children of comparable age levels from the two countries. Although most of the data for this paper emerged in answer to question number five of the interview schedule, ("What teaching materials do you consider most effective in the development of language power?") other comments related to methods and materials emerged in answers to some of the other questions and in various other interview probes. Where appropriate, these have been included. In addition, comments related to the teachers' pre-service and in-service training have been included as this training relates specifically to methods and materials. Although all of the data in the total study could not be included, enough illustrative comments have been included to demonstrate various trends which emerged in the analysis of the data.

Teachers of Five to Seven Year Olds

English teacher one: Reading comes the first thing in the morning. My idea is to listen to children's experiences and to make the first period a time for helping them. They decide what they are going to do and I allow them responsibility to do the activity. They can develop their own experiences. My idea is that they take responsibility for themselves in doing the various work of formal English. We then have a break and a quiet time where we can talk to one another and then we do formal English. I hear them read. Each child has a file with his name written on it in colors. I do an initial assessment when the children first come to me as six-and-one-half to seven year olds. I give them the Schonell Reading Test since they have already had some early mechanics such as studying initial consonants. We work on the structure of words and use class dictionaries. We take words both from the dictionaries and from their own experience. Also I put in new words using formal techniques. Generally, I work from their experience around some theme. We talk about it, and then we do some reading and writing as well as poetry and drama, all around a particular theme. We do a lot of sharing of reading with other children and we ultimately make a class book. We use a language scheme called Breakthrough. I use flash cards to develop a coverage with basic words. I make a card for the child or he makes it himself. It then gets placed in his folder. We then refer back to that flash card and eventually the children begin to use their own language using Breakthrough but they still continue to have their own personal words in one section of the folder. Gradually they begin to build sentences. When they know the sentences they can begin to share the sentences with eachother and begin to make story books. We start using the folders, then we ultimately get past the folders. At some point the teacher must know when to stop using the child's folder and the language scheme and begin to develop creative writing. When children know enough words they can begin to work their way into creative writing. We have Nippers, a reading scheme, but it has working-class language in it and some of the parents objected. But mostly these were working-class parents who had just made it into the middle-class.

English teacher two: We give the Schonell Test at age seven years and from that we can see who is going to need help in reading. The Head usually does it herself. The Head monitors the whole test. The teacher and the Head listen to the child read orally and eventually we monitor the whole school. We eventually give both forms A and B of the Schonell. We do not use a reading scheme but we use the Breakthrough Language Scheme which was known as the Initial Literacy Scheme and consisted of some 'home made stuff' which came out of a school's council study done by Brian Thompson and David Mackay. It has been published by Longmans as Breakthrough and it does help us to use the child's language to help him to recognize words and eventually make sentences.

English teacher seven: I teach in an infant school and we have to work very hard to get to know a child when he comes to school. We need to get a one-to-one relationship with him. Ten percent of the children are really deprived in this school and sixty percent need a teacher's personal attention almost all the time when they are beginning to learn to read. I realize that many of the children understand very little of what I am saying to them. Many of the middle-class kids who have had books around the home understand me. We do all sorts of expression activities, painting, modeling, drawing -- creative things. I encourage them to get their hands in glue and paint, to express rhythm, jingles, to bring in animals like hamsters and rabbits, and then we draw and write about these things. I do the writing and they read what I write. They begin to copy the letters and to make their own books. That sort of activity goes on for almost a year with some, and with others for only a few weeks. Some will move fairly rapidly from writing single words to writing a sentence like, 'Daddy go to work,' or 'Where is my milk?'.

English teacher ten: The children come in from the home and when we see the parent's ability to communicate we can tell almost immediately whether the children will be fluent or not. Sometimes the children will point and not speak at all, or will get another child to speak for them. If we had play groups or nurseries in this community the children would come in to school with more language. Sometimes they have two ways of speaking, the playground way and the school way. Some children have great difficulty in listening when they come to school. We generally feel that reading cannot begin until speech has developed. We

begin to have the children handle materials when they first come into the school. We don't believe that any part of the school day can be disassociated from any other part. We try to stimulate conversation around various activities such as a water tray. We have an activity time at the beginning of the day. We try to make it a calming influence and listen to everyone for a while. We have news time and children will tell news or bring something from home. I usually ask them a question to stimulate their interest. We have color coded words and we have a different color for each day. We use a pre-primer called, My Little Book, which is part of the Janet and John Reading Scheme. I start on the big cards leading into the series, read them as a whole and use flash cards as we move into the books. I don't believe in pushing the children and we do not have any set point for all of them to be at at a certain age. We do pre-reading activities such as noting similar shapes.

Most children are from the working-class in this school (there are only four whose parents own their own homes), and I notice a significant difference between the experiences of children from the working-class and children from the middle-class.

American teacher one: We use a basic reading series which is adopted by the state and by our board of education. The problem is that with thirty-three children in a class, a few of the children already know how to read and have read the whole reader, and others are having trouble recognizing any of the words or doing any reading at all. I have to group them because there are so many differences in ability but that leaves me a very limited time to try to stimulate the ones who already can read. We have very few materials or good children's books that children who can already read can be referred to. Some of the children come to school speaking Black dialect and this seems to interfere with their reading. I have a few Spanish speaking children and it is virtually impossible for them to do any of the reading in the reader when they first come. I have managed to get a teacher's aide who is Spanish speaking and she works with these students but they mostly work on recognizing English words and it is important for them to be in an English speaking environment.

American teacher two: I teach second grade and although we have a state adopted basic reading series which we are supposed to make each child go through, I found after teaching three years in the school that it simply didn't work for some of the children. I use a combination of language experience and key word vocabulary with some children because they simply do not respond to the reader. Although the principal does not like us to depart from this reading series he has confidence in me and I have produced well on the California Third Grade Reading Test as did any of the ones in any of the other second grade classes. What this means to me is that the language experience approach would work for more children if we were allowed to use it.

American teacher twelve (Black): Most of the children who come to this school have almost no incentive to read. Very few of the parents do much reading, and there are very few books or magazines in the home. The reader is the first book that most of these children have ever encountered. Of course we use the pre-primers, flash cards and experience charts, and we try to relate the reading in the pre-primers to the words that the children use and know. It is clear that the primers and the other books in the reading series do not really represent much that these children have experienced in life so far.

Teachers of Eight to Eleven Year Olds

English teacher six: I use a variety of materials to get students interested in reading. We rely on the class library and the county library. I use Sound Sense for remedial readers and the SRA Power and Rate cards and the SRA library as well as diaries, puppet plays, poems, and stories. We also do a great deal of dictionary work which I make into crosswords such as lexicon crosswords, and we use the Ladybird cards for word building. We have also used television programs and the British Trader Alphabet Journal. As a part of English they make a choice from this journal as to a trade that they would like to investigate. Then they would visit a local coal shop and get extra materials. They then make their own books related to the topic they chose. We work on these from September to Christmas. We have competition for prizes

and give certificates for the winners. This is very good for junior children.

We have many visiting speakers, talking for example on road safety tests. Every morning the children start the day writing in their diary (no one looks at it). We also have watched the T.V. program "A Year's Journey," which is shown all around England. The children from advantaged homes where books are accepted are more sure of themselves. They are usually very ready to read and enter into discussions more freely. The children from less advantaged homes seem less sure of themselves, less free and are uncertain about joining into discussions. It takes a lot longer to help them get the right book. I can tell right away if a child comes from "the old village" or from the council estates. If they come from the council estates their English usage is usually not very good. They also have a different accent and you can occasionally tell from their clothing.

I have made my own automatic flash card machine and my own tachistiscope for the children who are slow learners. I notice that those who can speak freely and clearly are usually keen readers and able writers but many quiet shy individuals are avid readers and able writers as well. Some of the chatter boxes are retarded. The social class in this school comes out in the puppet plays. Children will have their parts written on paper. By and large, the good readers not only read but speak their parts fluently. They don't keep having to look at their paper, and will ad lib more readily. This is usually a class thing and the children from the working-class are much less good at this sort of thing.

We administer the Schonell Test for Reading in September, February, and in July, and also the NFER Sentence Reading test. We use a continuous form of assessment with the SRA. I believe that there is a necessity to utilize any out-of-school activity to the fullest advantage in oral work and writing. I tell them to walk down to the river and use their eyes, not just report what happens, but tell how they feel and what struck them and then to come back and draw and illustrate what they have seen and felt. We are just beginning a project on the effects of the M-5 coming in through W-------. We are taking photos to illustrate how it is now and we will show the turmoil as it is coming through and then we will also photograph how it looks after it has come through. We are doing a whole community study on this.

English teacher seventeen: In this school we believe that the school is a power house of language. We build language

into the school where we can. We hit them with language in the hall from the time they enter the school. Any adult converses with the children. We can bring more adults into the school with our open setting and we bring many parents into the school and try to tie the home and school together all the way along. We feel that it is necessary for speech fluency to come before reading, but we like to begin having students enjoy words for words sake. We even do the chanting of some silly riddles and rhymes with the younger children earlier in the school, and as they get older we work on a project. You saw the volcano and the castle. Our language develops as a result of working on the concepts which are developed when working on the project. The children first study the historical approach and find out words which are associated with castles and volcanoes. They have to do things like describe a volcano erupting and develop a whole vocabulary around whatever project we are doing. For materials we use junk materials which are talking points to explore language. We use sand paper, stones, shells, rabbits that children keep in the back of the school, reading games that teachers have made up themselves, and math games. We think that the reading schemes in some cases do the exact opposite of what they are supposed to do and inhibit language. For example, we have never had a child say anything like, "jump, jump, jump," which is a sentence you can find in the reading schemes. Of course there are some good imaginative reading schemes. Some schemes are better for some areas than others, for example. Our goal is to gear the material to the child's home language. We need to find out about his home language by talking with him and with his parents and then find books for each child which are geared absolutely for that child. Some of the teachers do like to tick off the phonics that are in the reading scheme with the various children. I make an initial assessment with the Stolt Pre-Reading Scheme, Flying Start, and go through the scheme with them. I believe that the open school helps language development and the assessment of language development. We use the Neale Analysis of Reading Ability at the end of every year which gives the child's reading age.

American teacher five: Our principal really was enthusiastic about the open school concept and when we moved into our new building there were practically no walls in it. We did put up some dividers and began to get the things

organized to do team teaching. The problem was that some of the people on the teams didn't like some of the other people on the teams. It ended up with some teams that we divided the open spaces up into three classrooms and simply taught our classes the way we would have if there had been no open school built. My team worked out very well because we all get along together and we keep being afraid that the principal will break us up for some reason. I think he trusts us and therefore we can get away with a lot such as not following the reading series or the district policy on teaching grammar. We really try to build a new curriculum and try to put reading, language, and literature all together. The problem is that if everybody in fifth grade isn't using the same books, and we use a book that a sixth grade teacher is going to use, that teacher is upset with us.

American teacher eighteen: I am committed to individualizing instruction particularly in reading. The problem is, it takes so much time. Also I don't have nearly enough books for the thirty-three children and there is no library in my school. Our district does not insist that we stick to a prescribed program but the parents feel that the children should get basic skills. We are very much a part of the "back to the basics" movement and with the statewide tests in reading coming in grades three and six there is no doubt that we have all become more apprehensive and somewhat more structured in our teaching.

American teacher twelve: Our district supervisor actually comes around and checks which page of the grammar book we are on. The worst problem is that the kids really hate the books we are using. The Roberts English Series is a beautiful set of books but it just doesn't work with the kids in this school and I've heard other teachers say the same thing. I have bits and pieces of poetry but there is no way that I can get the kids to go through the book page by page. Most of the books we have available for language and reading are like the Roberts Series. We depart from it every chance we get and use films, plays, field trips, and a variety of other projects to get kids interested in reading. The big problem is to make them aware that there are books that will really hold their interest.

Conclusions and Analyses

Although no statistical analysis of the data for this study has been attempted in this paper, it seems that several major trends emerge. Most of the English teachers in the study were in informal, open schools by American standards which they took for granted as the normal way of schooling. Most of them used a language experience approach which they called "teaching reading" which generally drew language from the experience of the children and bridged into reading in various contexts, although most stated that reading schemes existed in their school. No English teacher interviewed in this study would admit to relying upon a reading scheme as the basic material for teaching reading in any English school. In contrast, ninety percent of the American teachers interviewed indicated that not only did a reading series exist in the school, but that it was the basic material used for reading. Many said that supervisors and principals monitored where teachers were in the particular series and some stated that parents took a considerable interest in the placement of students not only in the various tests, but within the actual books of the series. Some American teachers stated that they felt sufficiently free to depart from the series to initiate activities on their own which they felt would be good for the particular students they were teaching. Most American teachers felt that they were asked to rely heavily on a reading series or language series with younger

children, and that this trend continued with the teachers of older children as well. Although a number of American teachers indicated that they were in sympathy with the concept of open education, they clearly saw external testing both statewide and commercial, as interfering with experiments in team teaching and open education. Many, expressing the same view as American teacher five stated that the pressures of accountability had resulted in putting the walls back up in what had originally been planned as an open school.

Few English teachers relied on reading schemes to any great extent and seemed much more inclined to take various stories and phonics charts and other elements out of reading schemes and use them for whatever purposes they felt necessary. Many English teachers noted that the children were engaged in conversation by all of the adults in the school and that there was a heavy stimulus on oral language development before reading was begun, and as reading continued. In fact, most stated that reading was based on oral language.

Many American teachers noted the influence of the Principal in forcing the dictates of the school district with respect to implementing various reading series. Fewer English teachers noted that the Head used such influence but all knew that the Head had such influence. One English teacher stated that the Head had

decided to use a particular test and monitored that test for the whole school. Generally, English teachers seemed to be less concerned with the restrictions placed upon them by the Head teacher or by the LEA than did American teachers. Most of the American teachers interviewed in this study seemed to see the bureaucracy consisting of the Principal, Supervisor, School Board, parents, etc., engaged in a kind of conspiracy to prevent them from working effectively with children. Many of them clearly resented the onset of various accountability measures and there was indeed always the hint that these accountability measures were being used for teacher evaluations rather than evaluations of children's achievement. Insofar as the use of materials, two major conclusions emerged from this study:

1. With few exceptions the English teachers interviewed in this study tended to use the child's natural language in beginning reading and continued to derive reading from language-related activities throughout the primary school years. Reading schemes were not used as the primary means of instruction but rather were used as they fit the means of a particular child at a specific time.

2. Ninety percent of the American teachers interviewed in this study noted that a reading series was the basic means for instruction in reading in their school. None of them used the language experience approach primarily, but some of them used the child's language to develop reading activities where the series did not seem to be appropriate.

Open Education and Accountability

At least half of the American teachers interviewed in this study had had direct experience with open education either in

their training or in actual practice. Approximately twenty percent of the teachers interviewed had been in what might be called "open" situations of some sort. As the comments of American teacher five indicated, because of lack of preparation of teachers and lack of harmony on many teaching teams thrown into open situations, some teachers and principals became dissatisfied with open education. In addition, various accountability measures, e.g. statewide testing programs and national assessment programs, have tended to make American teachers feel less experimental and generally forced them into a position of relying on traditional methods and materials. In addition, some research has shown that children in traditional schools make better scores on standardized test than do children in open schools. [17] Although such research is not conclusive, it adds weight to what already seems to be a significant trend away from open education in the United States.

In England, despite the conditions which brought about the formation of the Bullock Committee and its ultimate report, A Language for Life, there is now no question that the committee did not come up with evidence to support the fact that there were wholesale declines in standards of reading and literacy which were the result of open education or informal education. It is striking to an American observer and to many teachers caught up in accountability struggles in the United States to see that neither the

Bullock Report, nor any subsequent commentary, has proposed a major shift away from informal education and that the report itself stressed the importance of oral language in the early years of schooling and proposed that "monitoring should employ an array of techniques of a kind that will make assessment both reliable and valid." [18] Further, the Bullock Report seemed to offer many teachers "a basis for a shift of emphasis in English teaching. . . away from the fragmentary and mechanical, away from the conception of literacy that merely linked certain skills, away from the notion of high culture with many poor relations; it is a shift towards the promotion of competence and enjoyment in an increasingly broad field of linguistic activities, differentiated but firmly related, uniting language with literature, concerned with learners of all ages and abilities."[19]

So there seems to be little evidence from the conclusions from reactions to the Bullock Committee Report or from the reports of teachers interviewed in this study that there is dissatisfaction with the basic philosophy of open or informal education as it is currently being applied in England. Naturally, teachers express needs for more materials, lighter teaching loads, and more assistance to enhance their own effectiveness. Reactions to the Bullock Report in England have noted the mixing of definitions of reading from a psycholinguistic model to a behavioristic model which essentially means that the writers of the report were not able to

agree on the relationships between reading and language although the stress on oral language and on using children's language experience in reading is clearly present in the report. [20] Many teachers interviewed in this study seemed to have mixed language attitudes concerning children from the working-class and children from the middle-class and the fact that these are prevalent in England, whether in an informal or traditional setting, is explained very well not only by the comments of some of the English teachers in this study but by the work of Harold and Connie Rosen, who in their report of the Schools Council Project on Language Development in the Primary Schools, noted:

> However much the old-style of teaching of grammar is discredited, nothing will ever stop teachers conveying to children often in very subtle ways what their attitudes to language are. They may write in red ink in the margin, 'slang!' or stop to correct a child's speech or enjoy with a class an invented word. These deeply held attitudes will have a considerable effect for better or for worse and there is no escaping them. Anyway, children are, not surprisingly, interested in language but not in the kind of language teaching we have traditionally provided. They will play with words as they play with anything else. They make up nonsense, which is linguistic experiment, and the child's own oral culture, as the Opies showed so dramatically, is rich with language awareness and experiment. The playground and the street has its own verbal culture. . .[21]

The English teachers in this study seemed to find the materials for instruction within the language and the child. This was true of some of the American teachers interviewed although for the most part the American teachers in this study seemed more like victims who together with their children are being oppressed

by a vast array of tests, assessment techniques, and commercial publishers who continually erect a barrier between the child and the language.

REFERENCES

1. Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom: the Remaking of American Education, New York: Random-House, 1970, passim.

2. Rogers, Vincent R. (editor) Teaching in a British Primary School, New York: MacMillian, 1970, passim.

3. Rathbone, Charles H. Open Education: the Informal Classroom, New York: Citation Press, 1971.

4. Featherstone, Joseph. Schools Where Children Learn, New York: Riveright, 1971.

5. Niquest, E. Wallby and Hawes, Gene R. Open Education: A Source Book for Parents and Teachers, New York: Bantam Books Inc., 1972.

6. Frazier, Alexander. Open Schools for Children, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington D.C., 1972.

7. Plowden, Lady Bridget, et al. Children and Their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education, London: Her Magesty's Stationery Office, 1966, passim.

8. Marsh, Leonard: Alongside the Child: Experiences in the English Primary School, New York: Harper Colophon Books, Harper and Rowe, 1970.

9. Cox, C.B. and Dyson, A.E. The Black Papers on Education, Davis-Paynter, London, 1971, passim.

10. Shafer, Robert E. "National Assessment: Backgrounds and Projections," English Education, 7, 2, Winter, 1976, pp.67-78.

11. Start, K. B. and Wells, B. K. The Trend of Reading Standards, National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales, Slough, Buckinghamshire, 1972, p.67.

12. Ibid, p.68.

13. Gardner, Keith, "The State of Reading," in Smart, N. (editor), Crisis in the Classroom, London: IPC, 1968, p.23.

14. Interview with Sir Alan Bullock, St. Catherine's College, Oxford, England, June, 1973.

15. Bullock, Sir Alan. A Language for Life, London: Her Magesty's Stationery Office, 1975, passim.

16. In both England and the United States, supervisors, advisers, and university personnel were asked to recommend teachers in schools in various parts of the country (England) and in various parts of the city (Los Angeles) whom they personally knew were good teachers functioning in good schools representing the particular part of the city or country.

17. Wright, Robert J. "The Affective and Cognitive Consequences of an Open Education Elementary School," in American Educational Research Journal, 12, 4, Fall 1975, pp. 449-468.

18. Bullock, Sir Alan. A Language for Life, London: Her Magesty's Stationery Office, 1975, p. 37.

19. Watts, John. "'A Language for Life,'--A Comment on the Bullock Report from the National Association for the Teaching of English," in English in Education, 9, 3, Winter 1975, pp. 9-10.

20. Spencer, Margaret and McKenzie, Moira G., "Learning to Read and the Reading Process," in Rosen, Harold (editor), Language and Literacy in our Schools: Some Appraisals of the Bullock Report, London: University of London Institute of Education, 1975, pp. 7-27.

21. Rosen, Connie, and Rosen, Harold. The Language of Primary School Children, Harmonsworth Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1973, pp. 253-254.

APPENDIX A

Teachers and Schools in the Study: England

Headteacher:	Miss T. M. McLean
Teacher:	Mrs. Brady
School:	Essex County Primary Infant School, London
Headmistress:	Mrs. Ethel Seaman
Teacher:	Mrs. Joy Raban
School:	Norman First School, Norwich, Norfolk
Headmaster:	Mr. David Brown
Deputy:	Miss June Lee
Teacher:	Mrs. Barbara Wilding
	Mrs. Jean Ruddock
Headmaster:	Mr. Ron E. Letheren
Teacher:	Mr. David V. Roberts
School:	Landsdowne C. Primary School, Tilbury, Essex
Headmistress:	Mrs. V. B. Dacey
Teacher:	Mrs. Mary Gibbs
School:	Raynehurst County Primary Junior School, Gravesend, Kent
Headmistress:	Mrs. Marjorie Hughes
Deputy:	Miss Pam Lyth
School:	College of St. Matthias Infants School, Bristol
Headmistress:	Miss Dorothy Nash
School:	Sea Mills Infants School, Bristol
Headteacher:	Mr. S. Clayton
Teacher:	Bess Bullough
School:	Redhill Middle School, Castleford, Yorkshire
Headmistress:	Mrs. Elsie Hartley
Teacher:	Miss Jeanne Brumwell
School:	Redhill First School, Castleford, Yorkshire
Headmistress:	Mrs. Betty Durrant
Teacher:	Mrs. Julie Uremovich
	Mrs. Hailary Crosby
School:	Neithrop Infants' School, Banbury, Oxon

Headmaster:	Mr. Mike Hyatt
Teacher:	Mrs. Marilyn Hart
School:	Monument Hill C. Primary School, Woking, Surrey
Headteacher:	Miss V. Jay
Teacher:	Miss S. F. Vanryne
School:	Brixington County Primary School, Exmouth, Devon
Headmaster:	Mr. D. J. Allen
Teacher:	Mrs. Merle Schouten
School:	St. Andrew's School, Cullampton, Devon
Headmaster:	Mr. Wilf Saunders
Teacher:	Mr. Lewis Wilson
School:	Willand County Primary School
Headmistress:	Mrs. Sylvia P. Westerman
Teacher:	Mrs. Jean Clark Mrs. Doris Cockerill Mrs. Dorothy Margaret Field Mrs. Sylvia Dell
School:	Caldecott First School, Abingdon, Berkshire
Headteacher:	Miss Sheila Mackie
Teacher:	Mr. Colin Shackleton
School:	Thorpe Willoughby J.I. School, Thorpe Willoughby Nr. Selby, Yorkshire
Headmistress:	Mrs. Eunice Foster Mrs. Patricia Raper
School:	Cholsey County Infant School, Cholsey Nr. Wallingford, Berkshire
Headmaster:	Mr. James Wratten
Teacher:	Mrs. Gwen Wratten
School:	Bladon County Primary School, Bladon, Oxon
Headmaster:	Mr. George Wheeler
Teacher:	Mr. Terry Phillips Mr. Derek Ward
School:	Heartsease Middle School, Norwich, Norfolk
Headmaster:	Mr. Doug Champ
School:	East Wickham County Primary School, Welling, Kent
Headmistress:	Miss J. Ford
Teacher:	Mr. Bunch
School:	St. James C. of E. Junior Mixed School, London Borough of Newham, London

APPENDIX B

Teachers and Schools in the Study: Los Angeles, California

Alice Beckerman
Arlington Heights School, Los Angeles

Gloria Brookins
Union Avenue School, Los Angeles

Thelma Burnett
Trinity Street School, Los Angeles

Zelma Colby
Compton Unified School District, Compton

JoAnn Cooks
Woodcrest School, Los Angeles

Tanya Grace
Miramonte Elementary School, Los Angeles

Pearl Granato
Betsy Ross School, Culver City

Judith Gurvis
Arlington Heights Elementary School, Los Angeles

Charleta Jackson
West Vernon Avenue School,Los Angeles

Ferrell Kligman
St. Augustine's by-the-Sea, Santa Monica

Helene Korn
Arlington Heights Elementary School, Los Angeles

Ellen Lucas
Thirty-sixth Street School, Los Angeles

Eva Madkin
Santa Barbara Elementary School, Los Angeles

Shirley Meyerhoff
Santa Barbara Elementary School, Los Angeles

Natalie Mintz
Raymond Avenue School, Los Angeles

Cynthia Paul
Intermediate Opportunity School, Pasadena Unified School District, Pasadena

Detra Prete
Windsor Hills Elementary School, Los Angeles

Claire Quin
Betsy Ross School, Culver City

Sharon Scheinblum
Park Avenue Elementary School, Los Angeles

JoAnne P. Scruggs
Santa Barbara Elementary School, Los Angeles

Sandra Sims
54th Street School, Los Angeles

Marguerite Nyun Seinthein
Jefferson School, Los Angeles

Virginia Sneider
Grope Street School, Los Angeles

Nancy Tomlinson
Woodworth School, Los Angeles

Ann L. Webb
Fremont High School, Los Angeles

APPENDIX C

Interviews with Teachers

1. What do you consider to be the most important reasons for the development of language power?

2. What have you observed in your pupils about the development of their language power?

3. What do you consider to be the most important classroom activities to develop language power?

4. From your observations, what relationship seems to exist between the development of oral language ability and reading and writing?

5. What teaching materials do you consider most effective in the development of language power?

6. How do you evaluate progress?

7. What did you learn about developing children's language in your initial preparation to teach or subsequently? To what extent have you been able to use effectively in the classroom what you did learn?